

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10  
11 FREDERICK H. SHULL, JR.,  
12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND, et  
15 al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-02377-APG-NJK

**Order**

[Docket Nos. 35, 37]

16 Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion to stay discovery pending resolution of  
17 their motion to dismiss challenging personal jurisdiction and joinder thereto. Docket No. 35; *see*  
18 *also* Docket Nos. 4, 12 (motion to dismiss and joinder). Plaintiff filed a response in opposition to  
19 the motion to stay discovery, and a counter-motion for issuance of a subpoena. Docket Nos. 36,  
20 37.<sup>1</sup> The motions are properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

21 Evaluating the pertinent standards, *see AMC Fabrication, Inc. v. KRD Trucking West, Inc.*,  
22 Case No. 2:12-cv-00146-LDG-CWH, 2012 WL 4846152, at \*1-2 (D. Nev. Oct. 10, 2012); *see*  
23 *also Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-01859-LDG-NJK, 2013 WL  
24 12321307, at \*1 (D. Nev. Apr. 15, 2013), the Court finds that a stay of discovery is appropriate.  
25 Accordingly, the motion to stay discovery (Docket No. 35) is **GRANTED** and the counter-motion  
26 for issuance of a subpoena (Docket No. 37) is **DENIED**.

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Because Plaintiff is *pro se*, the Court construes his filings liberally. *See, e.g., Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).

1 In the event that resolution of the pending motion to dismiss and joinder thereto does not  
2 result in the dismissal of Defendants, then a joint proposed discovery plan shall be filed within 30  
3 days of the issuance of the order resolving the motion and joinder.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: March 26, 2019

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Nancy J. Koppe  
10 United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28